JUDICIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE (JISC)

October 01, 2010
9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Puget Sound Skills Center, SeaTac, WA

(Special Session)
Draft Meeting Minutes

Members Present:
Justice Mary Fairhurst, Chair
Mr. Larry Barker
Mr. Jeff Hall
Judge James Heller
Mr. William Holmes
Mr. N. F. Jackson (phone)
Mr. Rich Johnson (phone)
Judge Steven Rosen
Ms. Siri Woods
Judge Thomas J. Wynne, Co-chair

Members Absent:
Ms. Linda Bell
Chief Robert Berg
Mr. Marc Lampson
Judge J. Robert Leach
Mr. Steward Menefee
Judge Michael Trickey
Ms. Yolande Williams

Guests Present:
Ms. Marti Maxwell
Ms. Barb Miner
Mr. Kevin Stock
Mr. Roland Thompson

Staff Present:
Mr. Kevin Ammons
Ms. Vonnie Diseth
Mr. Bill Cogswell
Ms. Vicky Marin
Ms. Heather Morford
Ms. Pam Payne
Ms. Deven Zipp

Call to Order

Justice Fairhurst called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introductions were made.

Superior Court Case Flow & Calendaring Feasibility Study

Ms. Vonnie Diseth presented an update on the activity that has taken place since the last JISC meeting on August 18 around the Superior Court Case Flow & Calendaring Feasibility Study project.

Since the JISC meeting on August 18, the project team has been formed, Deven Zipp is the project manager and she is present with us today. Deven can be contacted via email at deven.zipp@courts.wa.gov. We conducted vendor demonstrations internally for the AOC staff. These are the same demonstrations put together for court staff last spring. The purpose was simply to educate AOC staff with the knowledge of solutions in the market place, many of the same ones you are seeing and having presented to you.

The outcome of the demonstrations and seeing the product tools was that the project team identified some potential risks with the project scope, specifically who the participants are. On September 1, the project team raised some of their concerns in a meeting with the project sponsor group. The project sponsor group had a discussion on September 9th with Jeff Hall, Vonnie Diseth, Judge Trickey, Judge Wynne, and Judge Warning to talk about what those concerns were. Some of those concerns (the major ones) centered around the fact that the Clerks were not participating in the feasibility study of the project. With the demonstration of all the tools that we saw, the

functionality was very integrated in all of those tools; not really separated out by who specifically was doing that function, but the functionality was just very integrated. As it turns out, at the same time that the project team was meeting and talking about those issues and concerns, the same concern was raised by the Superior Court Judges and the clerks. Then, as it turns out when we talked with the selected vendor for the feasibility study, they told us they shared the same concern as well. Everybody was coming to the same conclusion independently and at the same time.

During the discussion on September 9th, an agreement was made that the judges would talk about the concerns at their September 11th SCJA meeting. The outcome of the September 11th meeting of SCJA was that, they agreed that Judge Warning would attend the Clerks' meeting scheduled for September 23, and formally invite the clerks to participate on the project as an equal partner going forward. That meeting took place on September 23rd and a response from the clerks has not yet been reported.

In the meantime, over the course of September the project moved forward and we had scheduled sessions with the Superior Court Judges and the Administrators to vet the requirements that we've collected. We scheduled three separate meetings and I believe all of them have been completed. Out of these sessions, came a discussion that we need some additional meetings to further vet those requirements. I believe that's in the process of being set up and scheduled. While all this was happening, we deferred final negotiations with the vendor, MTG (vendor selected). And we talked with them and told them we had some issues that we were trying to work out internally before we went into final contract negotiations with them, so they were aware of that. As of yet, we have not finalized that agreement with them. We did talk about the schedule delay with the Superior Court Judges when we brought up these issues that if the agreement is to bring the clerks on board, that is going to delay and add some time to the project, of course, having to meet with them and talk about their requirements and get all that vetted. So, at the time we were talking about maybe a 60-90 day delay in the project to get the requirements involved in that.

Mr. Kevin Stock reported the clerks met with Judge Warning on the 23rd. During that meeting the clerks were asked to participate as equal partners. The topic is on our agenda and we are going to discuss it, but I don't think we're going to make a decision on Tuesday without having some more information. We want to be involved – we feel that this is a **very** important decision, but there are some things that would have to happen on our end to make it work.

We want to have the understanding that the judges and administrators are with us in this. We ask that representation from the public and from the BAR association be included as stakeholders on a new system. With the increased workloads, with the decreased funding that the clerk's offices are getting, the status quo on how we do our jobs now in SCOMIS is not going to work for us in three to five years. We need to have a system that's going to be able to enhance our users' ability to interface with our work and help us do some of the work we've done. That's going to be a critical piece of what's going to be requested from the clerks.

Ms. Siri Wood stated as a JISC rep, I will recommend that we join in, because I think we should be involved in anything that goes forward. All parties involved need to understand that the clerks' work is 3 or 4 times as complex as what the requirements of this project is right now. I think the

judges may want to look at what they want to do if we say; it's going to push it out further than the 90 days.

Justice Fairhurst answered the question of; is the initial target date of July 2011, still the target date? That was a date that was initially stated the Superior Court Judges, to say we want something and we want it in the near future. The date has been a careful consideration as we have been working on this, but I don't think even initially it was that realistic. I think it was more a message that this isn't a long term project; this is a current need and we need to have results sooner rather than later because we can't wait anymore. Do you agree with that Tom?

Judge Wynne, I would agree with that, and in talking to some of the Board members, I think the July 1st date came from two things. One, the frustration Justice Fairhurst just mentioned with not having anything to aid in case management for the last 15 years, that's been promised. And second, the realization that this has to be something that is really off the shelf. And that the judges didn't want to get into a building program of building a system. But, the judges realized that bringing the clerks in will mean a delay, and none of the judges really understood the impact of the request that was being made to begin with. Nobody really understood that they weren't really including the clerks to begin with.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth continued, what we want to get out of the feasibility study from the vendor is their recommendation on what is a reasonable scope and reasonable schedule and when would we be able to get it done.

Mr. William Holmes stated – Not knowing what the functionality is that we're discussing, the Juvenile divisions of the Superior Courts serve the superior court administrators, the judges, and to have clerks embedded in some cases in some departments so juvenile courts have some functions that are tied with what happened in the clerk's office, so I'm concerned that there may be a need to have a juvenile court administrator as part of this continuing discussion, as well.

Justice Fairhurst pointed out that the point William makes is a good one and whether it is as a co-sponsor or just as an involved stakeholder, it is something we should keep in mind. It is my understanding the ISD staff have spent time working on the requirements that have been collected in the past. So, we are not starting at ground zero.

Ms. Siri Woods stated the requirements that were written 4 or 5 years ago are really different than the way we're interacting now electronically with the public and the BAR association and we want to catch that.

Justice Fairhurst stated that based on her discussion with Vonnie the initial thought is that there would be two clerks, a judge, a court administrator, and Jeff Hall from AOC for the Executive Sponsor Committee for the project, but recognizing we might need juvenile, public, and BAR association. I'm not sure and I will leave it to the group to discuss internally and offline how that gets involved. But I don't want the group to be too large to keep it from moving forward, but I want those voices to be heard. So, whether the court administrator is invested with representing that or whether you have sort of expert source people who are providing that information so it's being considered and implemented. But I think those are important points.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth confirmed that a draft of the Executive Sponsor Committee was sent to the JISC members and that this was just an initial draft that the project team put together. Sierra Systems and Ernst & Young both identified having an Executive Sponsor Committee as a best practice for the project teams, especially for projects of this size and complexity. The Executive Sponsor Committee would work very closely with the project team and act as a body to go to in order to resolve issues, answer questions and help set direction. The draft that was sent is not final, please take a look at it and if there are comments they can be sent to Deven Zipp, the project manager.

Mr. N.F. Jackson requested that a copy of the draft be sent in an editable format for ease of providing comments.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth confirmed that the draft of the charter would be sent in a Word document.

Ms. Diseth stated that the initial 5 voting members of the Executive Sponsor Committee were recommended after a lot of time and thought was put into the draft of the Charter. We were trying to be very sensitive about the makeup of the committee, making sure it was balanced with fair representation so it wasn't thrown together lightly. We do encourage your input if you have concerns.

Judge Heller observed that as a limited jurisdiction court representative, that a non-voting member from the CLJ community might make sense to add as even though this project started out as a case management thing, it sounds like it might grow bigger and because I suspect this would become a hand-me-down system for us to replace DISCIS at some time in the future.

Ms. Vonnie Diseth stated that for the record, I would like to say that our project team will work with Kevin Stock to see what the clerk's needs are for their Tuesday Clerk's Association meeting and to see if we can provide something that will help with their discussion.

IT Governance Project Prioritization Tabletop Exercise

Mr. Bill Cogswell explained to the JISC members the rules and objectives of the IT Governance tabletop exercise. For the first part of the exercise, the participants were divided into two groups and given a set of mock IT requests to review and prioritize amongst their teams. For the second part of the exercise the teams were given additional IT requests to review and prioritize and then were asked to schedule those projects on a schedule board using a specific amount of resources and money. Throughout the exercise, the teams discussed the request contents, the guidelines and scoring worksheets used to review the requests, the JISC Priorities and Guidelines and the process the JISC will use to determine prioritization. The following recommendations, questions and preliminary decisions were discussed.

Recommendations and Observations

Fund and Resource Allocations:

- Over time we might want to cut into Jeff/Vonnie's discretionary funds. It might make sense to budget amounts of money into accounts for Jeff/Vonnie and the JISC.

It's very important to monitor resources for mandates and get a forecast of time spent on legislative changes and consider ISD costs and what is JIS funds, in-house funds, contractor funds and bodies. ISD will also need to self-police with people on their tasks and resource management.

Request Review Cycle:

- If CLUG's rank H/M/L and within that they have their priorities, than as JISC we only consider the highs. If we go to an annual process, it's a 1-2 day meeting and then just monitoring what the levels below JISC are doing throughout the rest of the year. It may be that JISC is getting things throughout the year but only deciding upon them once a year.

Additional Intake Information:

- It may be beneficial to have more details than less on the pros and cons included with each request if the request is not unanimous.
- There was some interest in having additional information on "cost savings" included with the request. Particularly who would benefit or receive the cost savings if the request was implemented.
- An additional box should be included on the request when the request is initiated for the requestor to indicate what other courts or groups may have an interest in this request.
- Add a box to the request form that asks who this request "serves"'; the courts, the public, other agencies, other
- Include an additional information box on the request to indicate whether this request requires an exception to the JISC principles, EA Standards, change in court rule etc.
- Add a box to the request that identifies if the request follows all statutes and court rules (would this mean that we need to have legal review for all requests?
- Recommendation to add to the initiate form a list of questions that the requestor should be able to answer before submitting a request.
-

Additional Guidance Information:

Other:

- Additional clarification was requested on the definitions for the Delegation Matrix specific to what constitutes an enhancement.
- Add an "other" to the JISC Priorities & Guidelines boxes to allow the CLUG level to define another important "principle or guideline" that may not be identified in the JISC Principles & Guidelines.
- Regarding the JISC Priorities & Guidelines, the "Quantify Value" seems like it should lead to a formula and if it does, can AOC surface this formula to the JISC and Governance process for decision making.
- Add a box to the request that asks about the political environment in relation to the request (Is there something going on that we should know about or can leverage)

Preliminary Questions & Decisions

- The members present at the Special October 1st session agreed that the intent of the Delegation Matrix was to give Jeff/Vonnie the final decision at their level of delegation and that the JISC would not overturn their decisions.

- Judge Heller would like to present for consideration a change to the JISC Priorities & Guidelines which would include “considering emerging technology”, specifically acknowledging that there has been an increase in the public’s access to the internet and emerging technology and we should consider that.

- If the request is not in the current functions of what AOC provides in its portfolio and it falls into the Delegation Matrix for Jeff/Vonnie to decide upon, should Jeff/Vonnie have the authority to act when it’s a request that changes the portfolio or should it instead be sent back to the JISC to decide upon?

- Should money be set aside specific to the Appellate budget to work on support for the Appellate Courts?

- The members present agreed that there should be no re-prioritization in short term. Once its underway its set, there has to be a catastrophic reason to change direction on a request.

Next Meeting

The next regular JISC meeting will be October 27, 2010, at the AOC SeaTac facility; from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Adjournment

Being out of time the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.